

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
NORTHERN DIVISION**

Linn Rooney,

Plaintiff,

V.

Nationwide Recovery Systems; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.: _____

COMPLAINT

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Linn Rooney, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of Defendants’ repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. (“FDCPA”), and the invasions of Plaintiff’s personal privacy by the Defendants and their agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.

2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. The Plaintiff, Linn Rooney (“Plaintiff”), is an adult individual residing in Columbia, Maryland and is a “consumer” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

5. Defendant, Nationwide Recovery Systems (“Nationwide”), is a Texas business entity with an address of 2304 Tarpley Road, Suite 134, Carrollton, Texas 75006, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

6. Does 1-10 (the “Collectors”) are individual collectors employed by Nationwide and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

7. Nationwide at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

8. The Plaintiff incurred a financial obligation in the approximate amount of \$285.00 (the “Debt”) to AT&T (the “Creditor”).

9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to Nationwide for collection, or Nationwide was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. Nationwide Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

12. Within the last year, Nationwide contacted the Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt.

13. Nationwide placed numerous calls to Plaintiff’s residence in an attempt to collect

the Debt.

14. Nationwide discussed the Debt with Plaintiff's roommates, which caused Plaintiff a great deal of embarrassment and emotional distress.

15. Nationwide threatened Plaintiff with incarceration if the Debt was not paid immediately.

16. Plaintiff felt extremely threatened and fearful and was forced to provide Nationwide with his bank account information.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

17. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.

18. As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

19. The Defendants' conduct was so outrageous in character, and so extreme in degree, as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency, and to be regarded as atrocious, and utterly intolerable in a civilized community.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

20. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

21. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692b(1) in that Defendants contacted third parties and failed to identify themselves and further failed to confirm or correct location information.

22. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692b(2) in that Defendants informed third parties of the nature of Plaintiff's debt and stated that the Plaintiff owed a debt.

23. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692b(3) in that Defendants contacted third parties in regards to the Plaintiff's debt on numerous occasions, without being asked to do so.

24. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(b) in that Defendants communicated with individuals other than the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff's attorney, or a credit bureau.

25. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d in that Defendants engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse the Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt.

26. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.

27. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2) in that Defendants misrepresented the character, amount and legal status of the Debt.

28. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(4) in that Defendants threatened the Plaintiff with imprisonment if the Debt was not paid.

29. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) in that Defendants employed false and deceptive means to collect a debt.

30. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendant constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

31. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's violations.

COUNT II
VIOLATIONS OF THE MARYLAND CONSUMER DEBT COLLECTION ACT
MD. CODE COMM. LAW § 14-201, et seq.

32. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

33. The Defendants are each individually a “collector” as defined under MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-201(b).

34. The debt is a “consumer transaction” as defined under MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-201(c).

35. The Defendants repeatedly contacted the Plaintiff with the intent to harass or abuse, in violation of MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-202(6).

36. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages proximately caused by the Defendants’ violations.

COUNT III
INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION

37. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

38. The *Restatement of Torts, Second*, § 652(b) defines intrusion upon seclusion as, “One who intentionally intrudes...upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person.”

39. Maryland further recognizes the Plaintiff’s right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus Defendants violated Maryland state law.

40. The Defendants intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff’s right to privacy by continually harassing the Plaintiff with repeated telephone calls in an attempt to collect the Debt.

41. The telephone calls made by the Defendants to the Plaintiff were so persistent and repeated with such frequency as to be considered “hounding the plaintiff” and “a substantial burden to her existence,” thus satisfying the *Restatement of Torts, Second*, § 652(b) requirement for an invasion of privacy.

42. The conduct of the Defendants in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.

43. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from the Defendants.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against the Defendants:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against the Defendants;
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A) against the Defendants;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney’s fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against the Defendants;
4. Actual damages pursuant to MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-203;
5. Actual damages pursuant to MD. Ann. Code. Bus. Reg. § 7-401(b);
6. Actual damages from the Defendants for the all damages suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff; and
7. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: November 18, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By /s/ Forrest E. Mays_____

Forrest E. Mays (Bar No. 07510)
1783 Forest Drive, Suite 109
Annapolis, MD 21401
Telephone: (410) 267-6297
Facsimile: (410) 267-6234
Email: mayslaw@mac.com

Of Counsel To
LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.
A Connecticut Law Firm
1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (203) 653-3424
ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF